

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

In the Drawings

Figure 9 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because it does not include reference number "18B" in the description on page 22. A replacement figure is presented herewith for figures 9. The reference number "18A" of original Figure 9 has been amended to illustrate reference number "18B". In addition, "Computer System (A)" of original Figure 9 now illustrates "Computer System (B)". These changes correspond to changes made to the specification as discussed below. No new matter is entered by these amendments to the drawings.

In the Specification

The specification is objected to based on the informality on page 5, line 2, wherein the reference number "10" should be "11". The specification is appropriately amended, as indicated above, and the objection can be removed.

In addition, the specification has been amended in concert with the drawing corrections noted above. For example, two references inadvertently made to reference number "18N" in Figure 9 have been amended to correctly refer to reference number "18B".

1 **In the Claims**

2 **Claims Objections**

3 **Claim 18** is objected to because of a supposed informality on line 19 where
4 the word “for” is repeated. However, Applicant is unable to find the word “for”
5 within claim 18. Applicant is also unable to find the word “for” repeated anywhere
6 within the specification. Accordingly, claim 18 has not been amended and Applicant
7 respectfully requests that the objection to claim 18 be withdrawn. Clarification of
8 this objection is respectfully requested if the objection is to be maintained.

9 **Claims 15 and 20** are objected to because “the” storage medium should be
10 replaced with --a-- storage medium. Applicant has amended claims 15 and 20 to
11 recite “the storage device” rather than “the storage medium”. The amendment
12 remedies the objection, and Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to
13 claims 15 and 20 may now be removed.

14 **Claim 21** has been objected to for lack of indentation of limitation under
15 MPEP 608.01(m). Applicant has amended claim 21 to provide indentation as
16 suggested.

17
18 **§ 1.131 Declaration**

19 Applicant submits herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 and
20 supporting documentation to evidence that the invention was conceived in the
21 United States prior to the January 18, 2000, filing of the non-provisional application
22 of the provisional application No. 60/176,489 for Publication No. US2002/0055924
23 to Liming. Accordingly, the Publication No. US2002/0055924 to Liming should be
24 removed as a reference because it is not prior art.

1 The Declaration is signed by the named inventors and declares that they
2 conceived in the United States, prior to January 18, 2000, the ideas as described and
3 claimed in the above-identified application and as listed in the Declaration.

4 The Declaration and attached documentation (i.e., a disclosure document
5 entitled, "Unified Setup Architecture (USA)") make clear that the subject matter of
6 the subject application was conceived in the United States prior to the January 18,
7 2000, filing of the non-provisional application of the provisional application No.
8 60/176,489 for Publication No. US2002/0055924 to Liming.

9 Furthermore, the Declaration, the disclosure document, and additional
10 attached email documentation between patent counsel, the inventors and others (i.e.,
11 a first email having a heading of "Subject: RE: Set-Up meeting notes"; and a second
12 email having a heading of "Subject: RE: MS# 142462.1 'Simplified Set-Up Based
13 on Single User Identifier' patent application") show that a constructive reduction to
14 practice of the invention was diligently pursued beginning prior to January 18, 2000,
15 and continuing through to the filing of the above-identified application. The
16 disclosure document was prepared prior to the January 18, 2000, filing of the non-
17 provisional application of the provisional application No. 60/176,489 for Publication
18 No. US2002/0055924 to Liming. The subsequent email correspondence evidences a
19 continual process of pushing the application through to filing.

20 Together, the disclosure document and first and second emails evidence
21 "conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with
22 due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of the application"
23 (MPEP § 715.07).

24 Accordingly, the Publication No. US2002/0055924 to Liming should be
25 removed as a reference because it is not prior art.

1
2 **§102 Rejections**

3 **Claims 1-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly
4 anticipated by US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0055924 to Liming. In
5 view of the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131, the Publication No.
6 US2002/0055924 to Liming is removed as prior art. Therefore, the §102(e)
7 rejection to claims 1-26 is not supported. Applicant therefore respectfully requests
8 withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection to claims 1-26.

9 **Claims 32-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly
10 anticipated by US Patent 5,838,907 to Hansen. Applicant respectfully traverses
11 the rejection.

12 Independent **claim 32** recites in part:

13 issuing a configuration request from a computing system,
14 wherein the configuration request includes an identifier associated with
the computing system and/or computing system user; and
15 receiving a response to the configuration request at the
16 computing system, the response including one or more computing
system resources, wherein the one or more computing system resources
17 are automatically installed and configured on the computing system.

18 In rejecting claim 32, the Office relies on Hansen at col. 3, lines 15-61, and
19 col. 2, lines 50-67. However, Hansen does not teach “issuing a configuration
20 request” and “receiving a response to the configuration request” that includes “one
21 or more computing system resources” that are “automatically installed and
22 configured on the computing system” as recited in claim 32.

23 Rather, Hansen teaches a method of configuring a remotely located network
24 device, where a request for configuration from the network device is detected. In
25 response to the request for configuration, a reply is transmitted which identifies a

1 configuration file. The reply to the request for configuration does not include “one
2 or more computing system resources” that are “automatically installed and
3 configured on the computing system” as recited in claim 32. Rather, the reply
4 “identifies” a configuration file. Then, a separate/second request is made “for the
5 identified configuration file”. Upon receipt of the second request for the identified
6 configuration file, the configuration file is transmitted to the network device.
7 (Hansen; col. 3, lines 15-61).

8 Therefore, Hansen does not teach all of the elements of claim 32, and the
9 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is not supported. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests
10 that the rejection to claim 32 be withdrawn.

11 **Claims 33-36** depend directly or indirectly from claim 32, and therefore
12 include all of the elements of claim 32. Therefore, claims 33-36 are allowable for
13 at least the same reasons discussed above regarding claim 32. Applicant therefore
14 respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection to claims 33-36 be
15 withdrawn.

16 17 **§103 Rejections**

18 **Claims 27-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly
19 unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0055924 to Liming
20 in view of US Patent 5,838,907 to Hansen. In view of the Declaration under 37
21 C.F.R. §1.131, the Publication No. US2002/0055924 to Liming is removed as prior
22 art. Therefore, the §103(a) rejection to claims 27-31 is not supported. Applicant
23 therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection to claims 27-
24 31.

1
2 **Conclusion**

3 All pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant
4 respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present
5 application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the
6 application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to
7 discuss the unresolved issue.

8
9 Respectfully Submitted,

10
11
12 Dated: 4/29/04

13 By: Nathan R. Rieth
14 Nathan R. Rieth
15 Reg. No. 44302
16 (509) 324-9256; X233
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25